

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being canceled.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7 and 11 are currently being amended.

Claims 14 and 15 are currently being added.

This amendment amends and adds claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending and adding the claims as set forth above, claims 1-15 are now pending in this application.

Objection to Claim 1:

In the Office Action, claim 1 was objected to because “special printing” recited on line 10 of that claim should be changed to “the special printing”, according to the Office Action. By way of this amendment and reply, claim 1 has been amended to make such a correction, whereby presently pending claim 1 is now unobjectionable.

Claim Rejections – Prior Art:

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-8, 11 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,332,170 to Ban; claims 4, 9 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,452,694 to Eisenberg et al.; and claims 5 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ban in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,169,863 to Osari. These rejections are traversed with respect to the presently pending claims under rejection, for at least the reasons given below.

As shown in Figure 3 of Ban, that reference discloses a printer in which printing jobs received from each terminal are separately stored as an “ordinary job” and a “manual feed job”, whereby the ordinary job is normally executed and whereby the manual feed job is executed only when a manual button 32 is pressed. A CPU 110 of the printer identifies the

paper feed designation information of the received print jobs and sorts them out to an ordinary job and a manual feed job (see Figure 6, element 122 of Ban).

Therefore, in the printer of Ban, when a printing job is to be executed in the case where the first page to be printed is a tab paper sheet and the second and subsequent pages to be printed are normal paper sheets, it is necessary to execute this job as the ordinary job and the manual feed job at different timings. That is, in such a case, it is necessary to perform a first input operation for executing a printing job on the first tab paper sheet and a second input operation for executing the printing job on the second and subsequent pages of normal paper sheets, whereby these first and second input operations are performed separately (i.e., perform input operations twice).

In contrast, in the present invention, when the printer receives a printing job, it determines whether a page index of each page or a job index of the printing job includes information on special printing, and suspends for a while the printing job which includes the information on special printing in the page index or the job index before executing it at a suitable timing. That is, in the present invention, it is possible to handle a printing job which includes printing on a tab paper sheet and on normal paper sheets as one job. Accordingly, it is unnecessary in the present invention to perform input operations twice for performing two types of printing included in one printing job, as required in the device of Ban.

Since neither Eisenberg nor Osari rectifies the above-mentioned deficiencies of Ban, all of the presently pending claims are patentable over the cited art of record.

New Claims:

New claims 14 and 15 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that are believed to provide a separate basis for patentability of those claims, beyond the reasons provided above for their respective base claim.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 18, 2006

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819